

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The examiner has objected to the drawings because figures 1-8 are labeled in a non-English language and because figures 5-8 are referenced in a non-English language as well. The examiner has therefore required a proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings. Applicant has carefully considered this objection but it is most respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

The application was originally filed in a foreign language and thus the originally filed drawings include non-English language text. However, substitute drawings which do not contain any of the objectionable non-English language text, were filed in response to a "Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application" in which the same objection was raised. In particular, the aforementioned "Notice" required substitute drawings because the original drawings contained text that is not in English.

Applicant filed a complete and timely response to the aforementioned Notice. The response included the required substitute drawings which do not contain the non-English language text. A copy of the stamped and dated receipt card which shows that applicants previously filed response to the "Notice" included the required substitute drawings is enclosed herewith along with copies of the substitute drawings which were filed with the previous response. In this regard it is to be noted that applicants response to the aforementioned "Notice" was filed on April 10, 2002.

Serial No. 10/021,072

In view of the above, applicant submits that the drawings which are currently of record in the application do not include any non-English language text as alleged by the examiner. Accordingly, applicant submits that the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

The examiner has objected to the abstract because it is too long and because it contains two paragraphs. Accordingly, applicant has amended the abstract so that it is now only one paragraph. It is also to be noted that the abstract is within the range of 50-150 words.

The examiner has objected to claim 17 because it recites the limitation "further" in which there is insufficient antecedent basis. The examiner urges that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the term "further" because the claim is not dependent upon any other claim. Accordingly, applicant has amended claim 17 so that it is now dependent on claim 16. Applicant submits that there is now appropriate antecedent basis for the term "further".

The examiner has objected to claim 6 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, applicant has amended all of the claims so that they include the limitations of claim 6 therein. In this regard it is to be noted that there are no intervening claims with regard to claim 6 since claim 6 depends directly from claim 1.

Serial No. 10/021,072


In view of the above, it is clear that all of the prior art rejections in items 4-10 on pages 3-6 of the office action have been overcome. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all the claims which are currently present in the application.

Date: April 13, 2004

BACON & THOMAS  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

S:\Producer\jdb\SANKYO\TASAKI 021072\A03.wpd

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph DeBenedictis  
Registration No. 28,502